MEETING HIGHLIGHTS
Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group
Management Council

May 25, 2000
ETB Columbia River Room
8:15 a.m. – 12:00 noon

AGENDA

INTRODUCTION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Debbie Trader introduced Harry Boston as the new Chair of the Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG).

EXPECTATIONS OF THE STCG – Harry Boston, RL

Harry briefly went over the new RL organization and shared his personal philosophy of the STCG. Hanford has a legacy from 40 years of plutonium production processes. One outside perception is that Hanford cleanup is a slow boat to nowhere. We know that's not the case, so we need to change that perception by making significant progress on our baseline schedule. Harry feels that there is a real challenge on this site getting technologies used.

STCG STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP – Debbie Trader, RL

Debbie Trader showed the new structure of the STCG, including the new Chair, Harry Boston, the Co-Chair, Paul Kruger, and the five Subgroup Leads. The Subgroup Leads will meet with the Chairman once a month. The Management Council will provide leadership and strategic integration, and will have quarterly meetings.

UPDATES

- **Capitol Hill S&T Exhibit (Debbie Trader, RL) –** The Hanford Site put together two displays for the exhibit on Capitol Hill in April. The displays showcased progress that has been made in solving site problems. Displays were done by all DOE sites in an effort to try to restore some of EM-50's credibility. The sites received good feedback from Gerald Boyd and Carolyn Huntoon.

    - **S&T Needs Process 2001 (Jim Hanson, RL) –** Hanford's needs process has been a little out of sync from the rest of the planning process. With the new FY 2001 process, we are in phase with the Baseline Updating Guidance (BUG) and will update needs concurrently with development of the multi-year work plans.

    - **Subgroup Updates –** Updates were heard from all the STCG Subgroup Leads.

BHI TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT STATUS – Abdul Dada, BHI

Abdul presented a chart showing the BHI deployments planned for the year. BHI will be deploying six or maybe seven technologies this year. Most of the equipment will be available for other deployments. Some of them are multiple deployments already.

FH TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW – Terry Walton, FH

Terry presented Fluor Hanford's strategy for building an integrated technology program. An MOU has been created between FH and PNNL to help make sure that there is integration with the projects and the R&D organizations.

SPENT FUEL S&T PLAN – Bill Miller, FH/NHC

Fluor Hanford has been conducting Project reviews and asked the Spent Nuclear Fuel Project to build a Science & Technology Plan that would be the pilot for other projects. Bill Miller presented what went into the S&T plan and what they expected out of it. He said the plan was relatively painless to develop and the returns were well worth the effort they put into it. S&T planning provides an opportunity to fit technology into the project baseline.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS / WRAP-UP

- Update on Tanks activities and status of ORP S&T needs since HTI was cancelled
- Committee report on revisiting the Hanford Technology Deployment Center
    - Discuss what it was to be, why it wasn't implemented, and is there a future for it.
- BHI Project S&T Planning
- Role of STCG in Keith Klein's third outcome – The Future
    - Maximize use of technology for the benefit of society
    - Train people to deploy technology
- Update on how well Hanford is doing competing with other sites for EM-50 funding
- BHI/FH 100-Area and 300-Area River Corridor integrated plans

The next meeting will be held on Wednesday, **August 16**, from 8:15 a.m. to 12:00 noon. In the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

ACTIONS

- Take a look at the old Deployment Center documents that identified barriers to deploying technologies. An ad hoc committee was formed consisting of Debbie Trader, Nancy Uziemblo, Dan Tano, Gary Ballew, Roger Pressentin, Dennis Faulk, Terry Walton, Bill Bonner, and Abdul Dada. The group will report back at the next meeting.

HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP
MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

May 25, 2000
ETB Columbia River Room
8:15 a.m. – 12:00 noon

INTRODUCTIONS/ANNOUNCEMENTS

Debbie Trader provided an overview of the agenda and introduced Harry Boston as the new Chair of the Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group (STCG).

Introductions were made around the room, and Harry noted that it was a good group. He was delighted to see the wide range of participants; tribes, regulators, stakeholders, contractors, and DOE were well represented.

Gary Ballew announced that Roger Collis has left the Pacific Rim Enterprise Center, and Steve Gerritson has been named Executive Director.

EXPECTATIONS OF THE STCG
Harry Boston, RL

Harry briefly went over the new RL organization and shared his personal philosophy of the STCG. First, he said that, while there are now two DOE offices at Hanford, we are still one site. All the problems are Hanford problems.

Harry Boston is RL's Deputy Manager for Site Transition, responsible for the bulk of the mission work. Lloyd Piper is the Director of the Office of Performance Assessment. Both Harry's organization and Bob Rosselli's organization are focused on outcomes. They are inter-dependent, and this interdependency is the key to success. Wade Ballard is the Assistant Manager for Planning & Integration, which is responsible for long-term planning. Wade's organization is developing an integrated plan with the Site's vision and mission.

Hanford has a legacy from 40 years of plutonium production processes. One outside perception is that Hanford cleanup is a slow boat to nowhere. We know that's not the case, so we need to change that perception.

Keith Klein's vision is to: (1) restore the river corridor, (2) transition the central plateau, and (3) work for the future. Our mission is to (1) protect the Columbia River and clean up the environmental legacy of more than 40 years of plutonium production operations, (2) transition the site for future uses, long-term waste management and stewardship, and (3) put Hanford's assets to work supporting and promoting science, technology and other components of the national DOE mission.

The Richland Operations Office cleanup funding for FY 2000 is $720M, with $726M requested for FY 2001. We recently asked for an additional $140M for compliance and more for infrastructure improvements.

We can change the perception of the site by making significant progress on our baseline schedule. We are trying to accelerate the restoration of the river corridor. We have a good baseline, but now we need to do the cleanup more efficiently. Our 300 Area is bigger than the entire Fernald site in Ohio. There are opportunities in the central plateau also, and we are not going to get there without technology.

Vision for site transition:

- Protect people and the environment while we accelerate cleanup
- Work with our local regulators and stakeholders
- Increase our worker involvement
- Place a premium on innovative thinking
- Provide contract incentives.

Harry feels that there is a real challenge on this site getting technologies used, and thinks he is in a position to help. He appreciates the HAB involvement, since they are immersed in policy issues as well as technical issues. He is in a learning mode – don't hesitate to educate him.

STCG STRUCTURE AND MEMBERSHIP
Debbie Trader, RL

Debbie showed the new structure of the STCG, including the new Chair, Harry Boston, and the Co-Chair, Paul Kruger. There are five Subgroups:

- Subsurface Contamination (Arlene Tortoso, Lead)
- High-Level Waste Tanks (Joe Cruz, Lead)
- Nuclear Materials (Allison Wright and Bob Holt, Co-Leads)
- Mixed Waste (Greg Sinton, Lead)
- Facility Transition, Deactivation and Decommissioning (Roger Pressentin and Jim Goodenough, Co-Leads)

The Subgroup Leads will meet with the Chairman once a month. The Management Council will provide leadership and strategic integration, and will have quarterly meetings.

It has been unclear whether the Tanks Subgroup would restart under the leadership of ORP. Harry Boston talked to Dick French recently, and received positive feedback.

Questions/Comments:

Pam Brown indicated that she was glad to hear Harry's positive attitude on the STCG. She thinks that the goals for the STCG are great. Without the Management Council, there is no "cross-fertilization" from sharing technology experiences across programs. It will be important for the subgroups to make regular presentations to the Management Council. The Management Council is the only place where the HAB can get an understanding of the real problems and challenges at Hanford. It is difficult for her to personally be involved in the subgroups because they are very technical. Gordon Rogers and she have been recruiting HAB members to attend the subgroup meetings, and the HAB still needs to fill one vacant position on the Management Council.

Nancy Uziemblo stated that outside vendors don't know who to go to with their technology solutions. We need to publicize our structure better, and may need to go back to the Deployment Center concept. Also, she asked if Harry would entertain the co-leads of the subgroups being non-DOE people.

Debbie Trader indicated that there must be strong participation from DOE projects and contractor projects. It's up to them who they appoint as the co-lead.

Roger Pressentin added that he has talked to some pretty irate outside vendors who can't get in. Some of them have been invited to make presentations to the STCG subgroups.

Pete Knollmeyer has always been a strong supporter of having the contractors actively involved in the subgroups. Having a co-lead as a contractor guarantees that they are involved.

Julie Erickson noted that Dan Tano is currently serving as the RL point of contact to direct vendors to the right people.

Dennis Faulk said that having quarterly Management Council meetings is a great idea. We have come to a level of sophistication with the subgroups functioning well. But the Management Council has failed in breaking down the barriers to technology deployment. The best concept he ever saw that didn't get implemented was the Deployment Center. We should see if we could implement it now.

Dirk Dunning said that he gives guidance to vendors not to go to Hanford, since there is no welcome mat. He also feels that stakeholders or regulators should be considered as candidates to be subgroup co-leads.

Terry Walton pointed out that it's been a long time since we've had a lively discussion in a Management Council meeting. He thinks that the Deployment Center concept causes greater confusion to vendors. Should we send vendors to technology advocates or technology decision-makers? The Deployment Center was not made up of decision-makers. We need to be cautious in getting vendors to the decision-makers. He has accessed the Hanford S&T needs from his home computer to see if he could determine who the decision-makers are. He has been successful, and feels that this is where the vendors should go.

Joe Cruz urged us to work through the Procurement Office. In the next couple of weeks he hopes to get Dick French's approval to start a Tanks Subgroup.

Gary Ballew pointed out that at $1.5B a year, Hanford doesn't buy a lot of stuff. Things have grown so much that small companies can't compete.

Gordon Rogers stated that it's important for the contractors to buy into the S&T needs. BHI's participation is vital to the Subcon Subgroup and is really the primary driver.

Beth Bilson feels that the best leaders are those who are most interested in providing that leadership – we should not close the door on anyone. But it is really important that they are tied to a requirement from the site. A non-DOE subgroup co-lead is OK, but there must also be a DOE co-lead for accountability. It's hard to deploy technologies on this site due to barriers such as the need to provide continuing employment, the procurement process, funding issues, etc.

There are lots of barriers to technology and few encouragements. Is the Hanford Site significantly different from other sites? Is the problem indicative of Hanford?

Abdul Dada said that BHI has a group that takes a suggested technology and compares it against their needs. Then they make a determination and send it to the project. BHI evaluates every technology that is brought to their attention.

Dirk Dunning stated that one problem is that EM-50's focus changed to near-term deployment of technologies. There is not enough focus on engineering tools (e.g., the corrosion probe). There is no place for them to fit into the process. There are lots of small companies that have good technologies that don't fit anywhere at Hanford.

Pam Brown said that the people in this group are S&T advocates, and we have not been connected to tanks since Cathy Louie's departure. We really hope that the link will be made officially.

Pete Knollmeyer said that Gary Ballew was right about vendors running into a brick wall. The Management Council should address procurement barriers. He recommends that we look at the old list of barriers that we identified in 1996.

Harry Boston agreed that we should look at the old Deployment Center information and re-visit the barriers to technology deployment. We can't promise the vendors that their technologies will be used, but we can expand their pool of opportunities. Labor and procurement barriers are artificial, and we can get around a lot of them.

ACTION: We need to dust off the old Deployment Center material to see how it will fit today. An ad hoc committee was formed to do that and will report back at the next Management Council meeting. Committee members are Debbie Trader, Nancy Uziemblo, Dan Tano, Gary Ballew, Roger Pressentin, Dennis Faulk, Terry Walton, Bill Bonner, and Abdul Dada.

UPDATES

Capitol Hill S&T Exhibit – Debbie Trader, RL

There was a request in February/March from OST for each of the sites to prepare a display that could be shown in Congressional office buildings highlighting progress that has been made in solving site problems. This was an effort to restore EM-50's credibility. The Hanford Site put together two displays, one for RL's River, Plateau, and Future theme, and one for the Office of River Protection. The Sites received some really good feedback from Gerald Boyd and Carolyn Huntoon. They feel the effort was worthwhile, and plan to make it a yearly event. The displays were in the ETB lobby for the STCG members to view. They will be set up at the Hanford Advisory Board meeting in La Grande, Oregon the first week of June.

Harry Boston commented that Corporate Forum awards were given for technology deployment. Savannah River received an award for the most technologies and Albuquerque received an award for the most technologies per project. He would like RL to get an award like those to send the message that technology money sent to Hanford is wisely invested.

S&T Needs Process 2001 – Jim Hanson, RL

Hanford has been working on S&T needs for the past 5 years, and our needs have been described as the some of the best in the Complex. However, our needs process has been a little out of sync from the rest of the planning process, and we are trying to correct this. With the new FY 2001 process, we are now in phase with the Baseline Updating Guidance (BUG), which is to be issued around June 15. We will update needs concurrently with development of the multi-year work plans. Information gathered will be fed into IPABS. We are trying to decrease costs by melding these two processes together. The needs process will specifically identify actions for the DOE subgroup leads to endorse the needs in the September-November time frame.

Terry Walton said that integrating S&T planning with the BUG is a big deal, and we expect to save a lot of money. This opportunity was partly made possible by what the STCG did last year in creating a more streamlined S&T needs process.

Subgroup Updates

Subcon Subgroup – Gordon Rogers provided the update in the absence of Arlene Tortoso.

100-N Area ITRD Project:
Workshop held February 9-10. Conclusion is that they have done enough studies and have enough data to make recommendations by the end of this FY.

Carbon Tet ITRD Project:
- Workshop held March 8-9.
- Hope to finish activities by end of summer and do a ROD amendment in early fall, shooting for implementation of the major work in FY02. Test plans will be written and approved in FY01.
- The GW/VZ Expert Panel is currently reviewing the Carbon Tet work and will provide feedback.
- The NETL (formerly FETC) Industry Program is planning a solicitation for subsurface access in difficult geologic conditions and characterization of DNAPLs at Hanford. Vendors will be here in June to see the area. The solicitation will be issued in August and the award will be made in December for a 2-3 year program that addresses Hanford needs.

In Situ Gaseous Reduction of the 100-D Area Chromium Plume:
- Draft work plan for demo was completed on February 1.
- PNNL is working with BHI on plans to install injection and extraction wells in early July.
- Tracer test planned for August.
- Gas injection/treatment will be initiated on September 1.
- Treatment will take 3-5 months.
- The site is up gradient of the ISRM site, so the two technologies will be working in tandem.

Laser Drilling with the Cone Penetrometer:
- PNNL proposal to use a 3 kW Nd:YAG laser with the cone penetrometer.

- UC Santa Barbara has a MOU with the Navy to use their laser.
- Planning lab demos of existing and laser-enhanced drilling technology, an engineering effort to design a laser drilling head for the cone penetrometer system, and field demos in the 100 and 200 Areas.
- Subgroup unanimously endorsed this technology.

Status Reports on Selected S&T Needs:
At each meeting, BHI provides status reports on selected S&T needs. We have finished reviewing all the first-priority needs and are stating on the second-priority needs.

New Proposals to SCFA:
- Hanford developed five proposals on long-term barriers and submitted them to SCFA at the end of March.
- Two high-priority projects for Hanford are funded for FY01: Vadose Zone Monitoring for the Hanford Surface Barrier and Hydrologic Characterization of the Vadose Zone at Hanford.
- The other three proposals are still being reviewed.

The Cutting Edge Technology Report – Hazardous Waste Video:
The Subgroup watched this 25-minute video on cleanup technologies used at various DOE sites. Dennis Faulk (EPA), Wayne Soper (Ecology), Julie Erickson (DOE-AMT), and John Fruchter (PNNL) were featured in the video. ISRM was one of the technologies highlighted.

Nancy Uziemblo commented that BHI's monthly status reports on the Subcon S&T needs are very valuable. She thinks the other subgroups should do the same thing.

<u>Mixed Waste Subgroup</u> – Greg Sinton

The Mixed Waste Subgroup had a presentation from PNNL on robotics activities and heard feedback on the MWFA end user review. In April a proposal was submitted to the MWFA on size-reduction technology for an M-91 facility to deal with remote-handled TRU.

Terry Walton added that Hanford is ahead of most other sites in addressing RH TRU functional requirements. However, we are having trouble keeping this activity funded. Two proposals were sent to the MWFA. We need to identify the functional requirements for dealing with RH TRU.

<u>D&D Subgroup</u> – Roger Pressentin

The NAS is in town this week looking at D&D needs at DOE sites. John Sands has been instrumental in arranging this. Roger invited STCG members to attend the public comment session at noon.

The D&D Focus Area is again looking at opportunities for large-scale demonstrations (e.g., F Basins, 300 Area).

It has been reported that the ASTD proposals were all awarded to site closure activities.

The B&W laser might have been a victim of the Los Alamos fire.

AEA (from England) has been on site doing a tank cleanup investigation. They will be coming in June to talk to the D&D Subgroup. Joe Cruz mentioned that AEA would be doing some work for ORP later in the year. They have recently hired a local representative. They've done a lot of work for OR. Abdul Dada said that AEA is also coming to BHI next week.

Roger said that there was some surplus equipment from Oak Ridge (e.g., the LDUA, Houdini). Some if it is mildly contaminated and some is clean. He asked if Hanford could use it.

Nuclear Materials Subgroup – Allison Wright

They are just getting up to speed and learning how they fit in with the organization at HQ. They have information on the NMFA that they are reading. Pete Knollmeyer said that the NMFA has $16-20M that is not tagged to ongoing projects. We need to aggressively go after that pot of money. We are going to submit unsolicited proposals. There may be some synergy between D&D and NMFA on glove box size reduction. Harry Boston asked them to keep him up to speed on the proposals.

Bill Bonner reported that a couple of PNNL people were nominated to be Product Line Managers for the Nuclear Materials Focus Area.

BHI TECHNOLOGY DEPLOYMENT STATUS
Abdul Dada, BHI

Abdul presented a chart showing the BHI deployments planned for FY 2000.

- Small-Diameter Geophysical Logging System – This is in use now. It is one of the real success stories, with an ROI of 4000%. Approximately 20 million cubic meters of soil did not need to be remediated, resulting in a $7 million savings.

- Liquid-Level Detection Technology (Ultrasonics) – This is in use now.

- Remote Concrete Sampling System – This is one of the technologies being deployed under CDI. Staff are currently being trained to operate the Brokk system. Deployment is planned for June.

- 3-D Visual and Gamma Ray Imaging System – This has been used in the past and it is planned to be used again.

- Remote Drain Line Characterization Technology – BHI is working with PNNL on this. A robot containing characterization technology will go into the drain line. It will be used for future RODs for the canyon facilities.

- Liquid-Level Detection Technology (Thermography and/or Ultrasonics) – BHI is trying to decide now whether we need it or not.

- In Situ Object Counting System – This gives the quantity and type of contaminant on the wall. It was used in the large-scale demo at Argonne. It will be used at Hanford, and Brookhaven is also planning to use it.

BHI will be deploying six or maybe all seven of these technologies this year. Most of the equipment will be available for other deployments. Some of them are multiple deployments already.

FH TECHNOLOGY MANAGEMENT OVERVIEW
Terry Walton, FH

Fluor Hanford publishes a monthly Technology Management report. Terry asked those members who want to receive a copy to sign up. It includes upcoming activities, status of deployments, and other articles of interest. Roger Pressentin commented that it is a good report; he would like to see links to other web sites included.

FH follows five "Best Practices" for an integrated technology program:
- Establish a structured process for technology planning
- Foster active involvement between technology programs and projects
    - MOU between PNNL and FH -- make sure that we have integration with the projects and R&D organizations
- Get top management commitment (authority and money) for near-term and longer-term needs
- Organize for effective technology planning and buy-in by all functions
- Hold technology organization and projects accountable for measurable results (document payback)
    - Document results (cost savings, etc.) and hold organizations accountable

They have held project reviews. These reviews will ultimately be a key contributor to a Science & Technology Plan.

The MOU with PNNL is aimed at 4 specific areas:
- Assign PNNL staff on the projects – brings capability of the Lab to the projects
- External S&T interface – already working through the Focus Areas; build on the strength and political clout of the Lab to identify opportunities for collaboration (like EMSL)
- Technical project reviews
- Working with FH to provide the scientific basis for endstate activities within the projects

By integrating R&D with the projects, the Laboratory is more engaged at Hanford to help them, and will have influence on the baseline.

Pam Brown asked about the possibility of PNNL conflicts of interest. PNNL scientists have ongoing programs that they want to keep funded, and FH has needs. How can FH be sure that their desire to continue what they are doing is not in conflict with using something else? Terry said that FH controls the funds and the decisions. The MOU provides a core set of activities. For example, PNNL is leading the effort for technical reviews. The makeup of the team is FH, other DOE sites, the Lab, etc. We get the right technical people involved. He has not seen the opportunity for conflict of interest.

Pete Knollmeyer applauded PNNL and FH for creating the MOU. Obviously, there will be benefits. But if not properly managed, a research person can run amok. The project folks need to manage them properly. Terry said that they are using the GW/VZ Program as an example. Their management plan is their guidance document on how to make this work and manage it. They expect to see some progress this year, but in October they will start to see some impact. They already have some fresh ideas on how to break down some barriers. The strength of the MOU is that is was built from the bottom up, not from the top down.

SPENT NUCLEAR FUEL S&T PLAN
Bill Miller, FH/NHC

Bill Miller, the Chief Engineer for the Spent Nuclear Fuel (SNF) Project, said that when Terry Walton suggested building a Spent Fuel S&T Plan as a pilot for other projects, he wasn't sure that it would be of value. Now they are glad they were a guinea pig. The results will change their baseline. His presentation covered what goes into an S&T plan and what comes out of it. Copies of the plan were made available for those members who wanted details.

If you're going to have an effective project, you need an S&T plan that is integrated with your project.

- Effective S&T program requires short-term and long-term planning
- Projects forced to focus more on short-term technical needs
- Proper S&T planning enables projects to provide focus on long-term technical aspects

Purpose:

- Provide a framework to:
    - Identify technology needs
    - Develop effective solutions
    - Mitigate technical risk
- Integrate S&T solutions into project scope, schedule and budget
- Provide linkages with national S&T programs
- Assure decisions are technically defensible

Approach:

- Has to be owned by the project
- Patterned after other successful S&T roadmaps
- Build upon technical attributes in projects
    - Project baseline
    - S&T needs
    - Technology insertion points
    - Technical studies

- Develop pilot S&T Plan for SNF Project
- Evaluate implementation for remaining FH projects

Plan Elements:
- Visual roadmap showing project schedule, science and technology needs and decisions, and technical activities
- Expanded details of S&T needs and decisions, and technical activities
- Logic diagrams showing technical path to project end points

Overview of SNF Project:
- 2100 cubic meters of spent fuel
- Basins were never designed for this long-term storage
- Goal is to get the fuel out of the basins and into long-term storage

Project Schedule:
Early in 2001, they will start moving fuel at K-East. In 2003, they will start moving fuel in K-West and removing sludge. In 2004, they will remove racks, etc. Most of the activities will be done in 2007. The fuel that is stored will be here for the next 40 years in the Canister Storage Building. At some point, there will be a need for a device to go in and inspect the storage vaults to ensure that there is no damage occurring to the walls, canisters, etc. We can look at other facilities that have the same problem to see if we can use some of their technologies to do this.

Technical Reviews:
- Sludge Accountability Measurement (FY00)
- Hot Testing of Fuel Retrieval (FY00)
- Canister Storage Review (FY04)

Emerging Needs:
- Contaminant Mapping Technology (FY02)
- Improve MCO Gas Sampling (FY02)
- Containment Mapping of K Basin (FY02)
- Decontamination of K Basin Pool (FY03)
- Removal of Immobilization Debris (FY03)
- Fixatives for K Basins (FY05)

They need to work with BHI to decide what the end use really is. It might be done all at the same time.

There are 12 engineering studies to be done, and they expect to accomplish 5 technology demonstrations and 14 technology deployments.

Technical decisions:
- Sludge Loadout Design (FY00)
- Sludge Container Design (FY00)
- Select Pool Decontamination Methods (FY03)
- Select Sodium Removal Process (FY03)
- Select Ion Exchange Column Removal and Resin Separation Methods (FY03)
- Select Resin Package (FY03)

Results/Conclusions:

- Shows how S&T challenges, technical activities, and project baselines fit together
- Project-oriented S&T platform
    - Systematic approach to define technology challenges
    - Technical paths to make decisions and answer needs
    - Builds on project information and baseline
    - Highlights the project's technical path
- Project ownership
- Specific S&T activities identified during the preparation of the S&T plan
    - 14 deployments mapped over the next five years
    - 3 technical reviews identified
    - 5 demonstrations
    - Supporting engineering studies
    - 6 key technical decisions
- Results to be integrated into Project baseline and outyear planning

Comments/Questions:

Beth Bilson asked if they got full value out of the lessons learned from the N Basin cleanup. Bill said, "not yet." In the next two years they will definitely study what went on at N-Basin, and at some older basins at Idaho.

Pete Knollmeyer asked how they develop project ownership. Bill said that there was some attitude that "we don't need this" or "we're beyond this point." Not everyone in the project believed that this was important. In the end, they found that they got value out of it. The success is that this information gets captured in our baseline.

Pete asked if they were looking at automatically updating their baseline when they update the S&T Plan. Bill said that the information is created in a way that it can be directly extracted and put into the baseline activities. They haven't made any irreversible decisions.

Jim Goodenough asked if they had anything similar to BHI's web site library. Terry Walton said that he didn't think so, but he will check. The Spent Fuel web site is basically unpopulated.

Jim Hanson commented that, over the last couple of months, you could see the enhanced communication between the projects as to how the waste streams are going to be handled in the future. Bill said that it was a successful integration job. He wants to implement technologies that are already proven.

Beth Bilson asked what the success criteria for this type of effort is. Terry Walton said that ultimately success would be defined in terms of whether we can demonstrate that we've performed cleanup faster. Are there demonstrated results from the pieces we're putting together? We can't look at these individually; we need to look at the aggregate.

Terry Walton said they tried to keep it simple but useful. Bill said the plan was something that was relatively painless to develop and the returns were well worth the effort they put into it. It provides an opportunity to fit technology into the baseline.

Harry Boston said that development of a technical baseline is good engineering. He would like to see this type of activity for every project. If it isn't in the project plan, it isn't going to get done. He would like to hear how BHI is doing this, too.

Terry Walton said that Jim Sloughter is the resident expert on how they made this happen. His ties to the project organization were extremely valuable.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS / WRAP-UP

- Update on Tanks activities and status of ORP S&T needs since HTI was cancelled
- Committee report on revisiting the Hanford Technology Deployment Center
  - Discuss what it was to be, why it wasn't implemented, and is there a future for it.
- BHI Project S&T Planning
- Role of the STCG in Keith Klein's third outcome The Future
  - Maximize use of technology for the benefit of society
  - Train people to deploy technology
- Update on how well Hanford is doing competing with other sites for EM-50 funding
- BHI/FH 100-Area and 300-Area River Corridor integrated plans

Next Meeting:

The next meeting will be held on Thursday, July 27, from 8:15 a.m. to 12:00 noon, in the EESB Snoqualmie Room. An agenda will be sent out.

Debbie Trader pointed out that we try to plan the meeting so we don't have interferences with other major activities. There are some conflicts on July 27, so we may have to change the date by a week or so.

UPDATE: The meeting has been changed to August 16, 2000, from 8:15 a.m. to 12:00, in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

ACTIONS

- Take a look at the old Deployment Center documents that identified barriers to deploying technologies. An ad hoc group was formed consisting of Debbie Trader, Nancy Uziemblo, Dan Tano, Gary Ballew, Roger Pressentin, Dennis Faulk, Terry Walton, Bill Bonner, and Abdul Dada. The group will report back at the next meeting.